

(b) (6)

From: HarborComments <HarborComments@epa.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, July 27, 2016 6:06 PM
To: PortlandHarbor
Subject: FW: Harbor Comments 1380

-----Original Message-----

From: drupal_admin@epa.gov [mailto:drupal_admin@epa.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, July 27, 2016 7:39 AM
To: HarborComments <HarborComments@epa.gov>
Subject: Harbor Comments

Submitted on 07/27/2016 10:38AM

Submitted values are:

Your Name: (b) (6)

Your Email: (b) (6)

Your Comments:

My primary concern about the in-river disposal facility is the lack of seismic protection. If the Cascadia earthquake hits a non-seismically protected disposal facility full of contaminated sediment, it will be right back in the river. At that point, why did we even spend money on it in the first place?

I recognize the limitations to shipping it offsite - the trucks from Portland Harbor would be going right by my house. However, where ever we put the sediment, it needs to be protected from the largest possible earthquake we are expecting from the Cascadia subduction zone. Despite the large amount of other contaminants that are going to be dumped in the river during a large earthquake (namely gas fields, industrial waste held shore-side, etc etc), to meet the EPA requirements of developing the executing the most cost effective project, we need to make sure that contaminated sediment, wherever it is located, is seismically protected in the case of a worst-case-scenario earthquake.